

REMARKS

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-identified Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-8, 10-15, and 17-20 are now pending, with claims 5, 6, 8 and 15 being independent. Claims 9 and 16 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The specification and claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 10-15, and 17-20 have been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not include new matter.

The Office Action objects to the title of the application. In response, Applicants have amended the title in the manner suggested by the Examiner. The specification was objected to because it included a hyperlink. Applicants have removed the hyperlink. Claims 6 and 9 were objected to because of informalities, which have been corrected. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the objections.

Claim 9 was rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Since claim 9 has been cancelled, the rejection is rendered moot.

Claims 1-20 were rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims have been amended to overcome the rejection.

Claims 1-4 were rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over allegedly admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,954,282 (Miyamoto). Claims 5, 6, 8-10, 15-17, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over allegedly admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,889,439 (Cook et al.). Claims 7, 11-14 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over allegedly admitted prior art and Cook et al. in view of Miyamoto. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants' invention, as recited in independent claims 5 and 6, is directed to providing a zoom property attribute to scale a multi-page document. The invention scales the multi-page

document according to the zoom property attribute and determines whether an amount of content on a last page of the scaled multi-page document is less than a predetermined amount. If the amount of content is less than the predetermined amount, the invention further scales the multi-page document down to fit a nearest whole page.

Applicants' invention, as recited in independent claims 8 and 15, is directed to determining whether an amount of content on a last page of printable pages is less than a predetermined amount. Further, when the determined amount is less than the predetermined amount, the invention determines a user preference for one of (i) scaling the content to fit the nearest whole page, which is the plurality of pages less one, and (ii) printing the plurality of pages. Where the user preference is for scaling, the invention provides a zoom property attribute to scale the content down to fit to the nearest whole page.

Thus, with the present invention as recited in the independent claims, it is possible to scale the pages of a multi-page document so as to accommodate overrun content on the last page into the nearest whole page. Applicants submit that Cook et al. does not suggest such a feature.

Cook et al. describes a system in which the last line of a paragraph, which would otherwise be printed on a new page, is printed on the previous page by ignoring the previous page's lower boundary. With such a system, the scaling of the document is not changed to accommodate overrun. Instead, the last page of the document displays content below the lower boundary enforced on the other pages of the document. Consequently, there may be an inconsistency between the lower boundary of the last page and that of the prior pages.

The present invention scales the multi-page document to prevent the overrun, rather than altering page boundaries. This feature is not taught by Cook et al. Further, the scaling of the present invention avoids inconsistent page boundaries which result from Cook et al.'s adjustment. In addition, the present invention may avoid problems with respect to the interaction between footer information and the lower boundary of a page.

Miyamoto is merely cited in the Office Action as describing the printing of a subset of pages according to user selection. Applicants submit that this document does not remedy the deficiencies of Cook et al. discussed above.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Cook et al. and Miyamoto, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the features of scaling a multi-page document according to a zoom property attribute, determining whether an amount of content on a last page of the scaled multi-page document is less than a predetermined amount, and further scaling the scaled multi-page document down to fit the nearest whole page when the amount is less than the predetermined amount, as generally recited in independent claims 5 and 6. Applicants also submit that those documents fail to disclose or suggest at least the features of determining whether an amount of content on a last page of printable pages is less than a predetermined amount, and when the predetermined amount of content is less than the predetermined amount (A) determining a user preference for one of (i) scaling the content to fit the nearest whole page, which is the plurality of pages less one, and (ii) printing the plurality of pages, and (B) where the user preference is for scaling, providing a zoom property attribute to scale the content down to fit to the nearest whole page, as generally recited in independent claims 8 and 15.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the independent claims are patentable over the applied art. The dependent claims should also be deemed allowable, in their own right, for defining other patentable features of the present invention in addition to those recited in the independent claims. Applicants request further individual consideration of these dependent claims.

Applicants, therefore, request favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action, and a Notice of Allowance.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Justin J. Oliver
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,986

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
JJO:yr

FCIS_WS 4595140v1